DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 894 IR 056 724

AUTHOR	Burns, Mary Ann
TITLE	The Use of the Rare Book Cataloging Standards in the OCLC Database.
PUB DATE	1996-12-00
NOTE	44p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Authority Control (Information); *Bibliographic Records; *Cataloging; Classification; Librarians; Library Expenditures; Library Materials; *Library Standards; *Library Technical Processes; Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS	Cataloging Backlogs; Descriptive Cataloging; MARC; *OCLC; *Rare Books; Special Collections (Library)

ABSTRACT

In order to produce adequate catalog records for rare books, catalogers concern themselves with detailed transcription of title page information and an exact description of the book. Another concern largely unknown in general cataloging is the tracing of special access points that relate the physical features of a book and terms for persons associated with the book other than the author. The identification and description of these special files often requires considerable scholarship and bibliographical sophistication. Rules for transcription and lists of thesauri terms for use with the MARC format have been in place for at least five years. Librarians have labored to make these standards a reality, but rare book and special collections librarians are plagued by backlogs, the high cost of cataloging, and changing technology--all of which can have a negative impact on the amount of time a cataloger has to create detailed records. Based on a sample of 10% of the rare book records entered into OCLC between 1991 and 1996, this study shows that while the use of rare books standards is fairly strong, the problems outlined above appear to have had an effect on the extensiveness of rare books records entered into the OCLC database. Although nearly half of the sample records were transcribed according to the "Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books" (DCRB), only 15% used special access points for rare books. Appendices include MARC fields for rare books; chronological history of cataloging and rare books standards; coding sheet for OCLC records; and examples of DCRB transcription rules and construction of special access fields. (Contains 22 references.) (Author/SWC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IR

ED 413 894

THE USE OF THE RARE BOOK CATALOGING STANDARDS IN THE OCLC DATABASE

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of
Library and Information Science

by

Mary Ann Burns

December, 1996

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Du Mont

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IR056724

ABSTRACT

In order to produce adequate catalog records for rare books, catalogers concern themselves with detailed transcription of title page information and an exact description of the book. Another concern which is largely unknown in general cataloging is the tracing of special access points that relate the physical features of a book and terms for persons associated with the book other than the author. Traditionally referred to as special files, their identifcation and description often require considerable scholarship and bibliographical sophistication.

Today we have rules for transcription and lists of thesauri terms for use with the MARC format that have been in place for at least five years. Many have labored to make these standards a reality but unfortunately rare book and special collections librarians are plagued by the realities of backlogs, the high cost of cataloging, and changing technology. All can have a negative impact on the amount of time a cataloger can give to creating detailed records. This study, which is based on a sample of ten percent of the rare book records entered into OCLC between 1991 and 1996, shows that while the use of rare books standards is fairly strong the problems outlined above appear to have had an effect on the extensiveness of rare books records entered into the OCLC database. Although nearly half of the sample records were transcribed according to DCRB only fifteen percent used special access points for rare books.

Master's Research Paper by

Mary Ann Burns

B.A., Hamline University, 1983

M.A., Case Western Reserve University, 1994

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1996

Approved by

Advisor Lois Buttlar Date 11-1-96

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		iv
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	4
CHAPTER II	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
CHAPTER III	METHODOLOGY	13
CHAPTER IV	ANALYSIS OF DATA	17
CHAPTER V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	25
APPENDIX A: MARC FIELDS FOR THE CATALOGING OF RARE BOOKS		27
APPENDIX B: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF CATALOGING AND RARE BOOKS STANDARDS		28
APPENDIX C: CODING SHEET FOR OCLC RECORDS		30
APPENDIX D: EXAMPLES OF DCRB TRANSCRIPTION RULES EXCERPTED FROM EXAMPLES TO ACCOMPANY THE DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING Of RARE BOOKS AND CONSTRUCTION OF SPECIAL ACCESS FIELDS		32
ENDNOTES		34
BIBLIOGRAPHY		36

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I USE OF THE RARE BOOKS STANDARDS 18

TABLE II RECORDS TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB AND USE OF NOTES 21

TABLE III RECORDS TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB AND USE OF ACCESS POINTS 22

TABLE IV RECORDS NOT TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB 24

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the second edition of his How to Catalog a Rare Book, published in 1973, Paul S. Dunkin distingushed the "ordinary" book from the rare book. "People want an ordinary book because they want to read it." The rare book, he wrote, "is a fascinating material object, a document in the history of civilization."[1] He further stated that "a rare book, unlike other books, cannot be bought by just anyone who happens to want it and has the cash to buy it."[2] And, as "books can be shared adequately only if they are catalogued adequately" his sobering conclusion was that a library that doesn't "put useful entries for them [i.e. rare books] into its own catalog and a union catalog is no better than the wealthy collector who hides his books away in a vault where he and a few friends can gloat over them."[3]

In order to produce adequate catalog records for rare books, catalogers concern themselves with detailed transcription of title page information and an exact description of the book. According to Dunkin, the record of a rare book that is cataloged adequately will tell the chief ways in which that book may differ from other editions and issues of that particular title, and all other copies of that particular edition and issue. It should also include collation by gatherings and collation by pages.[4]

Another concern for rare book catalogers which is largely unknown in general cataloging is the tracing of special access points that relate the physical features of a book (such as binder or print

type) and terms for persons associated with the book other than the author (such as a printer or engraver). Traditionally referred to as special files, their identifcation and description often require considerable scholarship and bibliographical sophistication.[5]

Before the advent of computerization the way in which this information was represented in the catalog record was determined mainly by local practice. In 1986 Flannery wrote that the levels of cataloging had traditionally varied from library to library, and sometimes varied even within the same rare books collection. She further reported that the possibilites inherent in computer technology had engendered a reexamination of rare book cataloging.[6] Rare book librarians have since put forth a great deal of effort to utilize the innovations of computer technology, the MARC format and the bibliographic utilities to make the sharing of bibliographic information of rare books possible. These efforts have centered on the development of standards for transcription and description in the MARC format, and the development of uniform terminology to be used as access points.

Today we have rules for transcription and lists of thesauri terms for use with the MARC format that have been in place for at least five years. The Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books (DCRB), published in 1991, serves as our national rare book cataloging code. There are six thesauri that have been produced by the Bibliographic Standards Committe of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the ACRL/ALA. These include: Printing & Publishing Evidence: Thesauri for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections

Cataloguing, Binding Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, Type Evidence: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, Paper Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, and the Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies and Catalogs Used in Rare Book Cataloging prepared by Peter VanWingen and Stephen Paul Davis. In 1993 a long awaited collection of examples of rare book cataloging records was produced, Examples to Accompany the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books. Tusa wrote in 1993 that for the "first time there exists an internationally agreed-upon standard for bibliographic control in machine readable form of rare materials with its concomitant benefits of increased access by the international scholarly community, exchange of information among collections curators, and rationalized collection development."[7] In 1992 Adkins called for the implementation of these standards.[8] Drawing from the "Standards for Ethical Conduct for Rare Book, Manuscripts, and Special Collections Libraries," she contended that it is the ethical responsibility of rare book librarians to provide access to their materials.[9]

Many have labored to make these standards a reality but unfortunately rare book and special collections librarians are plagued by other realities as well. Taraba, Stalker, and Dooley, all members of the committee that produced DCRB, acknowledged the problems of backlogs, the high cost of cataloging, and changing technology, all of which can have a negative impact on the amount of time a cataloger can give to creating detailed records.[10] Yet, on a positive note, Stalker and Dooley also wrote that the copies of printing in Europe

before 1801 constituted a large but finite body of material, and that a comprehensive database of such books, following a single descriptive standard, was imaginable.[11] Flannery pointed out that the combination of computer capabilites and thesauri of standard terms would make possible the recording of and access to materials that exceeded even Paul Dunkin's recommendations.[12]

Indeed, Davis conjectured that the development of national bibliographic and computer format standards could lead ultimately to a nationwide database for rare books and special collections.[13] And, too, now nearly ten years ago, he pondered the uses of digital technology and how we would see bibliographic retrieval systems merged to optical retrieval systems so that MARC records could be used to gain direct and immediate access to images of the original item.[14] Now, with access to local library catalogs via the World Wide Web, the necessity of using standardized access points and transcription practices to promote access to scholarly materials takes on an even greater importance.

Purpose of the Study

So, given all the implications of the use of standards and the formidible struggles rare book catalogers face, the purpose of this study is to determine to what extent the standards have been employed in rare books records in the OCLC database. Additional objectives are to determine how adequately are we sharing our rare book resources now and building for greater access in the future.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1986 Flannery addressed the issue of the need for rare book catalogers to adopt a consistent descriptive terminology as it would facilitate the transition to widespread use of machine readable cataloging, expanded access points, and greater cooperation among rare book and research libraries.[15] She pointed out the advantage of having thesauri terms attached to a catalog record which would make it possible for lists of items possessing certain characteristics to be generated.[16]

A year later Thomas wrote that standards were needed in order to communicate because they allow for uniformity of identity and uniformity of access. In order to properly identify and communicate the holdings of a library standardized descriptions were necessary, as well as the standardized access points required for the collocation, or the bringing of like materials together. The shared language for communicating, he wrote, was an accepted set of cataloging standards.[17] Thomas illustrated the consequences of a lack of standards by describing the problems with the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints. There is no standard for bibliographical description and so different editions or issues are on a single master record, or the same edition or issue is represented by more than one master record.[18]

Davis pointed out that the use of the bibliographic utilities had gradually imposed a never before seen basic consistency and standardization upon the catalog records of special collections.[19] He

warned that if national standards are not in place special collections records may be treated in the same way that nonspecial collection records are and and wind up being subject to whatever the local vendor or computer center wants to provide.[20] He observed that special collections departments that collaborate with each other are more successful in getting what they want from networks, vendors, and foundations.[21] He emphazied that there needs to be continuing effots to discuss the objectives of special collections cataloging with the bibliographic utilities and advised that specialized access points and copy-specific information be in a form compatible to the different bibliographic utilities.[22] With the coupling of nationally accepted bibliographic and computer format standards with technology, he saw the possible creation of a nationwide rare books and special collections database.[23] Six years later in 1993 the necessity of standards was still a significant concern when Tusa emphasized that the major issue in the computerazation of special collections was standardization.[24]

The current bibliographic standards foı automated systems were developed in response to the need for some level of consistency in book description at an international level. The International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) code, published in 1969, fulfilled this need.[25] It required that a catalog record include a minimal level of data that adhered to a prescribed sequence and punctuation in the following form: Title/Statement of Responsibility.--Edition Statement.--Place of publication : Publisher, date of publication.--Physical description.--ISBN (if available).[26] In 1973 the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic

Publications or ISBD(M) was produced by the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA). "It made no provision for exact transcription of title, for collation of every page, or for detailed information about facts of publication."[27] In the early 1970s it became apparant that a code was needed for older materials when the MARC format was used in cataloging projects at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Bodleian, and the National Library of Scotland with unsatisfactory results.[28] In 1975 the Committee on Rare and Precious Books, instituted by IFLA, began work on what became the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Older Monographic Publications (Antiquarian) or ISBD(A). In 1976 work on the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue began and again the inadaquacies of the ISBD codes were apparant.

Rare book librarians involved with retrospective conversion projects such as the ESTC were concerned that the rearrangement of title page information to adhere to the prescribed ISBD form would hinder efforts to make comparisons with other editions and copies of the same work. In the late 1970s many American librarians involved in work on ISBD(A) and the ESTC projects began to call for a national rare book cataloging code which the Library of Congress accepted responsibility for producing. In December 1979 the first draft was distributed entitled Rules for Bibliographic Description of Early Printed Books, Pamphlets, Broadsides, and Single Sheets.[29] These rules represented an attempt to incorporate provisions of ISBD(A) into a framework of AACR2. The two had not been coordinated earlier because AACR2 was being finished at the same time ISBD(A) was beginning. The material included from ISBD(A)

was the provision for an exact transcription of the title page, with transpositions indicated in a note, and a comprehensive collation that accounted for every printed or unprinted page.[30] Such provisions were not permitted under AACR2. Hence, the document allowed different works and different editions of the same work "to be described in such a way as to be clearly distinguishable for the purpose of comparison with other copies and other editions of the same work."[31] In December of 1980 the code was produced in its final form under the title Bibliographic Description of Rare Books and published in 1981. Once the need for an exact transcription of the title page had been fulfilled the next issue that needed to be addressed was the development of a standard terminology for access points containing special files information for use in the MARC format.[32]

Late in 1978 the International Research Libraries Association (IRLA) established the Ad Hoc Committee for Standards for Rare Book Cataloging in Machine-Readable Form which attempted to solve problems that had developed during the ESTC pilot project at the New York Public Library.[33] The committee issued a report in 1979 consisting of fifteen proposals that called for MARC format changes that permitted access to an item by genre, publisher, publishing or physical aspects of an item, and copy-specific information.[34] The proposals were submitted to the Library of Congress Automated Systems Office and then submitted to ALA's MARBI (Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information). The approved updates reported by Adkins are shown again here in Appendix A.[35] Most developments in rare book

standards occurred after this publication. The new MARC fields that were added and the new uses allowed for previously existing fields standardized the ability of rare books libraries to provide access to special files through computer records by intellectual genre, place of publication, names of publishers and printers, copy-specific names (donor, provenance, engraver), and publishing and printing descriptors of use to book historians. Now, descriptive terminology for the new MARC fields was needed.[36]

IRLA's proposals spurred the formation of the Standards Committee of the Rare Book and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries in June of 1979. This committee accomplished many of the goals proposed by the IRLA Ad Hoc Committee for Standardization of Terminology.[37] It produced thesauri for genre terms for use in the 655 field, printing and publishing evidence terms for use in the 755 field, binding terms for use in the 755 field, and a list of relator terms for use in fields 700 and 710 to designate functions of persons associated with a book. The committee also produced a standard format for bibliographic citations for use in the 510 field.[38]

In 1988 the members of the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committe, which was known as the RBMS Standards Committee until 1989, began to grapple with the problem that BDRB, our national rare book cataloging code, was becoming outdated. In 1988 AACR2 revised was published and the first revision of ISBD(A) was nearly completed. Rare Book catalogers had been working with BDRB for nearly ten years, and a survey revealed that though they thought it was an effective code in general, they wanted updates, clarifications

and corrections.[39] Also in early 1989, the Library of Congress had to decide whether to reprint or revise BDRB because its stock of copies for sale was nearly exhausted.[40] In response to these issues the Bibliographic Standards Committe of RBMS and Library of Congress staff members produced Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books, a revision of BDRB that was published in 1991. Many rules were reworded for greater clarity with no substantive change in meaning and some internal inconsistencies were eliminated.[41] It is transcription-oriented and is biased towards pre-1801 books hand-printed in the European tradition.[42]

Almost immediately after DCRB was published a subcommittee of the Bibliographic Standards Committee began work on Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books. Published in 1993, it was meant to be used as an illustrative aid to catalogers and others interested in or needing to interpret rare book cataloging. The examples are intended to be used as models and not substitutes for the DCRB rules. They were compiled to "promote effective and consistent use of rare book cataloging standards by providing models which illustrate those standards."[43] A chronological list of these standards is given in Appendix B.

Unfortunately there are significant obstacles that rare book catalogers face which affect the extensiveness of their cataglog records and the incorporation of the rare book standards. Taraba related that the climate was not a welcoming one for new cataloging codes as they had been traditionally envisioned. She cited backlogs, the high cost of cataloging, constantly changing technology, and current trends in access to materials.[44] Stalker and Dooley wrote of

the "current era of belt-tightening in the American academic community" where "rare book cataloging tends to catch the eye of library administrators desperate to cut costs."[45] Dooley observed that rare book cataloging could be "a lonely business" and that many institutions employed a single rare book cataloger, or perhaps half of a rare book cataloger, who bore responsibility for conceiving, rationalizing, and implementing a sensible, cost-effective rare book cataloging program.[46]

Yet despite the grim picture there is still optimism about the implications of wide spread use of the standards. As noted earlier, Stalker and Dooley thought the creation of a comprehensive database of copies of printing in Europe before 1801 following a single descriptive standard was possible.[47] There is Davis's vision of there one day being a nationwide database for rare books and special collections.[48] And there has been a call for rare book catalogers to take control of the less than optimal situation that confronts them. Taraba wrote, when head of the Rare Materials Cataloging Unit at Duke University, that the best way for catalogers to flourish despite the adverse conditions was for them to tackle the problems themselves and not wait for administrators to solve them.[49]

Despite the obstacles it appears that rare book librarians need to continue their efforts to promote the use of the transcription rules of DCRB and the thesauri terms available. Indeed Dooley made the most important point that "rare book catalogers absolutely must be actively involved in design and enhancement of local systems and must accept responsibility for rationalizing the inclusion of special files."[50] All of the fields and terms established are not searchable in

OCLC and local systems. Perhaps a small first step in having them made accessible is for rare book catalogers to include them in their records even though they may not be searchable. As Adkins observed, some of the fields are not searchable in the bibliographic utilities but my be eventually.[51] It may be easier to rationalize to administrators, systems coordinators, and bibliographic utilities the need for access to something that is already present in the database than for the need for access to something that is not yet there.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The goal of this study was to pull a random sample of book records, entered between 1991 and 1996 to date for books produced between 1450 and 1800 from the OCLC database. The range of dates, 1450-1800 was chosen because DCRB is designed mainly for the transcription of books produced through 1801. The year for beginning date of entry, 1991, was chosen because the last standards, Genre Terms, and DCRB, bear that date of publication. The sample was to represent ten percent of the total number of records entered into the OCLC database between 1991 and 1996 for books produced between 1450 and 1800. OCLC provided figures for the number of books produced between 1450 and 1800 in the database as of July 1, 1991 and as of July 1, 1996.[52] From these figures it was determined that 345,00 records for books produced between 1450 and 1800 had been entered into the OCLC database between 1991 and 1996 and that a sample of 435 records was needed to represent 10 percent of all the records entered.

The entries from 435 volumes of the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints were used to form the search keys. Beginning with the first entry of each sample volume, entries were reviewed in order systematically for an author that may have produced books between 1450 and 1800 and this name was used to form a personal author search key. Title entries as they occurred were also used to form title search keys or scan title search keys. Successful search results were reviewed in order and the first record that was entered

between 1991 and 1996 as indicated in the fixed field was used for the sample record for that volume of the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints. The OCLC online authority file was used to verify the form of the author names.

Each record in the sample was evaluated to see if it contained the following: (1) transcription according to the rules set out in DCRB, (2) gatherings note in 500 field, (3) citation note in 510 field, (4) thesauri term in a 655 genre field, (5) thesauri term used in the 755 field, (6) 752 field with hierarchical place name in a 752 field, (7) relator term used in a 700 or 710 field with a subfield$4 or subfield $e. A record was identified as using a standard if it used any of the seven elements listed above. Each record was coded with the form shown in Appendix C.

A DCRB transciption was determined by the use of one or more of the following: (1) double punctuation in the 245, 250, or 260, (2) linked elements in the 245, 250, or 260, (3) edition statement fully transcribed, e.g. "first edition" as opposed to "1st edition," (4) prepositions appearing before the place of publication in $a of the 260, (5) full transcription of $b elements in the 260, (6) use of "... [and # others]" in $b of the 260, (7) use of words, phrases, or Roman numerals in $c of the 260, (8) use of $e dcrb in the 040 field. For some records it was not possible to determine if DCRB had been used and these were assigned a separate code, undetermined. Examples of rules regarding the transcription of these elements and examples of the fields used for special access files are shown in Appendix D.

Two codes were used to describe a 510 citation note: (1) whether there was a citation note included in the record, (2) whether

the work cited was included in the Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies and Catalogs Used in Rare Book Cataloging prepared by Peter VanWingen and Stephen Paul Davis. The use of the 655 field was determined by its presence with a term from the Genre Terms: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. The use of the 755 field was determined by its presence with the use of a term from one or more of the following: (1) Printing & Publishing Evidence: Thesauri for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, (2) Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, (3) Binding Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, (4) Type Evidence: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, (5) Paper Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. The use of a relator term was determined by its presence preceded by a subfield $4 at the end of the the 700 or 710 field.[53] The records were also reviewed for the use of a relator term in a full or abbreviated form entered in a subfield $e following a 700 or 710 field.

The 435 sample records for the study were gathered from the OCLC database between July 3, 1996 and September 4, 1996. The NUC volumes used to form the search keys for the sample records were volumes 2 through 332, and starting with volume 335 every third volume through volume 683. Volumes 212-216, 269-270, 407, 611, 614, 617, 620, and 623 were skipped because they produced no hits.

Records representing volumes 53, 54, 55, and 56 (Bible) were gathered using the search title search "Bib,,,/bks/1500-1600". The

first record of each group of search results (1450-1499; 1500-1525; 1600-1607; 1700-1709) that fit the study's criteria was used. Records representing volumes 12, 13, and 14 (America) were gathered using the title search "ame,,,/bks/1600-1800." If an entry only gave the last name of the author an author/title search limited by the items date of publication was employed. Corporate author searches were formed from the first part ($a) of the entry and excluded any subdivisions. For example, "Portugal" was used to form the search key "=port,,/bks/1450-1800" even though the entry was followed by "Laws, Statutes etc." Names that occurred in See References were skipped.

Records with 500 notes indicating the item was cataloged from an imperfect copy with a missing title page were excluded, however a record for an item missing a frontispiece was included. Records for broadsides were excluded and records for single journal articles. Records representing an entire issue of a published journal were included. Only records retrieved with an author as a 100 field entry or a 700 field entry as an editor or translator were kept. If the author appeared in a 700 field as a printer or bookseller the record was excluded. This decision was based on the study's intent which was to sample records to see if they had been embellished with the added fields available to rare books catalogers. Added fields for translators and editors are common to all book records and not just rare books.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The results of the study are given in Tables I through IV. Table I shows the percentage of use of the rare books standards. Forty-three percent of the records could be coded as having been transcribed according to DCRB (A). Records with the fixed field element "Desc" blank were coded "no" as this indicates that the record is not based on ISBD which is one of the codes DCRB is based on. There was one instance where a record was blank in the "Desc" fixed field element but so clearly followed ISBD and DCRB that it was coded "yes." If an edition statement was abbreviated it was coded as "no" and there were instances where this was the determining factor in coding the record. Records which showed no hint of special treatment in their transcription but could not with certainity be considered "nos" were coded as "undetermined." Thirteen percent of the records in the sample indicated that they were cataloged according to DCRB with a $e dcrb in their 040 field (AA).

A gatherings note was given in eighteen percent of the records sampled (B). When the fifty-seven records with 300 fields for multivolume works were eliminated from consideration and only single volume works were considered the percentage of records with gatherings notes rose to eighteen percent. One record used "multiple pagination" in the 300 $a and was coded as a single volume work. One record for a multivolume item included a 500 gatherings note.

Citation notes were considered only if they occurred in a 510 field and if they occurred in a 500 field were disregarded. Twenty-

TABLE I: USE OF THE RARE BOOKS STANDARDS

CODE DESCRIPTION	%Yes	%No	%Undetermined
A. Transcription according to DCRB	43	41	16
AA. $e dcrb in 040	13	87	---
B. 500 Note with Gatherings	20	80	---
C. 510 Citation Note	21	79	---
D. 510 Citation Note using Standard Citation Forms	12	88	---
E. Genre Field 655	1.8	98.2	---
F. Place of Publication 752	14	86	---
G. Thesarus Term 755	.5	95.5	---
H. 700 or 710 Field with $4 relator term	4	96	---
HH. 700 or 710 Field with $e relator term	7	93	---
I. Records uses Standards (One or More of A-H)	50	37	13

one percent of the sample records used a 510 citation note (C). Twelve percent of the records used a form listed in the Standard Citation Forms (D). If a record contained two citation notes and only one form was listed the record was still coded as "yes." The record was coded "yes" only if the form matched that given in VanWingen and Davis exactly. For example one record used "Halkett & Laing" which appeared only for a second and third edition in Standard Citation Forms, "Halkett & Laing (2nd ed.)" and "Halkett & Laing (3rd ed.)." It was still coded "no" for the sake of consistency in coding. Of the ninty-three records using a citation note fifty-five of them use a Standard Citation Form, or fifty-nine percent.

Only fifteen percent of the sample records used some form of access point with some fields receiving hardly any use. The Genre field 655 (E) appeared in only eight records or 1.8%. "Periodicals" was used in two records, "Academic dissertations" in four records, "Eulogies" in one record, and "Fairy tales" in one record.

The percentage of use of the Place of Publication 752 field (F) was calculated using only records with a place given in the $a of the 260 field. Ten records with "S.l." or "n.p." in subfield $a or no subfield $a at all were excluded from consideration reducing the sample population size to 425 records. Of these 425 records fourteen percent used the 752 field.

The use of a thesaurus term in the 755 field (G) was even lower than the use of the 655 field with only two records of the 435 record sample making use of the field, or .5%. One record made use of three terms, two from Binding Terms and one from Type Evidence.

The other record used a printing term (rbpri) from Printing and Publishing Evidence.

The use of a relator term in the 700 or 710 field with $4 (H) was found in four percent of the sample records. Ten percent of the sample records used some form of relator term in subfield $4 or subfield $e. Seven percent used a subfield $e with a relator term in either full or abbreviated form. Three percent used a relator term in $e in its full form (HH) and four percent of the sample records used an abbreviated term. Three records used both a full form in a $e subfield and an abbreviated from in a $e subfield.

When the use of the fields in all the records in the sample was tabulated the results showed that half of the records used one or more of the standards listed in A through H (I).

Table II shows the use of DCRB transciption and the use of notes in the sample records. Fourteen percent used DCRB transciprition alone (J). Sixteen percent used DCRB transcription and a gatherings note (K) and sixteen percent used DCRB transcription and a citation note (L). Only eight percent, however, used DCRB transcription and both a gatherings and citation note (M).

Table III shows the use of rare books access points intherecords transcribed according to DCRB. Fifteen percent of the recordsused an access point (N) and only eleven percent used DCRB transcription andan access point(s) (O). Records using DCRB transcription, access points, and a gatherings note made up only 4.5% of the sample (P). Records using DCRB transcription, access points, and a citation note were found in only four percent of the records. (Q). Only two percent of the records were transcribed according to

TABLE II: RECORDS TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB AND USE OF NOTES

CODE	DESCRIPTION	%Yes	%No	%Undetermined
J.	DCRB Transcription only	14	72	14
K.	DCRB Transcription & Gatherings Note	16	83	1
L.	DCRB Transcription & Citation Note	16	82	2
M.	DCRB Transcription & Gatherings Note & Citation Note	8	91.5	.5

TABLE III: RECORDS TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB AND USE OF ACCESS POINTS

CODE	DESCRIPTION	%Yes	%No	%Undetermined
N.	Record Uses Access Points (E-H)	15	85	---
O.	DCRB Transcription & Access Points	11	88	1
P.	DCRB Transcription & Access Points & Gatherings Note	4.5	95	.5
Q.	DCRB Transcription & Access Points & Citation Note	4	95	1
R.	DCRB Transcription & Access Points & Gatherings Note & Citation Note	2	97.8	.2

DCRB, used access points, and had a gatherings note and a citation note (R).

Table IV summarizes the use of notes and access points in the sample records that were not transcribed according to DCRB. Four percent of the records that were not transcribed according to DCRB used a citation note (T) and three percent used access points (V). Two percent of the records that were not transcribed according to DCRB used both a citation note and access point(s) (X). Only a very small number of records, .23 percent used a gatherings note, citation note and access point (Y).

TABLE IV: RECORDS NOT TRANSCRIBED ACCORDING TO DCRB

CODE DESCRIPTION	%Yes	%No	%Undetermined
S. NO DCRB & Gatherings Note	1.15	98.62	.23
T. NO DCRB & Citation Note	4	95	1
U. NO DCRB & Gatherings Note & Citation Note.	.46	99.54	0
V. NO DCRB & Access Points	3	96	1
W. NO DCRB & Gatherings Note & Access Points	.23	99.54	.23
X. NO DCRB & Citation Note & Access Points	2	97.5	.5
Y. NO DCRB & Gatherings Note & Citation Note & Access Points	.23	99.77	0

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The sample records showed that the use of DCRB transcription is the most used standard from the list of items considered in this study with forty-three percent of the sample records adhering to its guidelines. The use of gatherings notes and citation notes is fairly strong as well with eighteen percent and twenty-one percent respectively of the sample records including them. The use of access points in the sample records was not extensive with only fifteen percent making use of them. The Place of Publication 752 field occurred most frequently in fourteen percent of the records. The use of relator terms in a subfield $4 or subfield $e in the 700 or 710 field was the second most used access point occurring in ten percent of the sample records. The presence of the Genre 655 field in 1.8% of the records was barely noticable as well as that of the 755 Thesarus term field present in only .5% of the sample.

When all factors are considered the use of rare book standards is shown to be fairly strong despite the pressures of backlogs and small staffs with fifty percent of the records sampled making use of either DCRB transcription, a gatherings note, citation note, genre field, 755 field, 752 field or relator term in the 700 or 710 field in subfields $4 or $e. When we look closer, however, we see that the sample records show that transcription according to DCRB is what is used most and that in fact the extensiveness of our rare books records may well be affected by shrinking budgets and staff. Counting gatherings for a 500 note as found in eighteen percent of

the sample records, and taking the time to look through sources to find the necessary information for citation notes found in twenty-one percent of the sample records is time consuming. Time consuming as well is the formulation of access points found in fifteen percent of the sample records. From the results of this study it appears we are still far from realizing a nationwide database for rare books and special collections that Stephen Paul Davis envisioned but making strides in the area of transcription that Paul S. Dunkin called for.

APPENDIX A

MARC Fields Approved for the Cataloging of Rare Book Special Files

Field Tag	Content Designation	Special File Use
510	Citation Reference/Note	Bibliographic citation of book bibliographies
655	Index Term-Genre/Form	Intellectual genre
700	Added Entry-Personal Name	Provenance, donors, illustrators printers, binders
710	Added Entry-Corporate Name	Publishers, printers binders
752	Added Entry-Hierarchial Place Name	Place of Printing/ Publication
755	Added Entry-Physical Characteristics	

APPENDIX B

Chronology of Events in the
History of Cataloging and Rare Books Standards

1967	AACR published
1969	ISBD code established
1973	ISBD(M): International Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications, 1st standard rev. ed. published
1973	Paul Dunkin's How to Catalog a Rare Book, 2d ed., published
1979	AACR2 published
1979	Independent Research Libraries Association's (IRLA) fifteen proposals are issued
1979	The Standards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ACRL/ALA is established
1980	ISBD(A): International Bibliographic Description for Older Monographic Publications (Antiquarian) published
1981	Bibliographic Description of Rare Books published
1981	"Relator Terms for Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Cataloging," 2d ed. issued in College & Research Libraries News
1982	Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies and Catalogs Used in Rare Book Cataloging prepared by VanWingen and Davis published
1983	Genre Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, 1st ed. published
1986	Printing and Publishing Evidence: Thesauri for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing published

1988 AACR2 revised published

1988 Binding Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing published

1988 Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing published

1989 The Standards Committe of the Rare Book and Manuscripts Section changes its name to the Bibliographic Standards Committee

1990 Paper Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing published

1990 Type Evidence: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare and Special Collections Cataloguing published

1991 Genre Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing, 2d ed. published

1991 Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books published

1993 Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books published

APPENDIX C

CODING SHEET FOR OCLC RECORDS

DATE _____ Date record entered in OCLC

1= yes 2= no 3= undetermined (for use with A)

A. ____ Transcription according to DCRB:
245 Double punctuation or 245 Linked elements or
250 Edition statement fully transcribed or
260 $a Preposition appear before name of principal publication or $b fully transcribed with printers, booksellers or use of "...[and # others]" or $c use of words or phrases or Roman numerals

AA. _____ $e dcrb in 040

B. ____ 500 note with gatherings

C. ____ 510 citation note

D. ____ 510 citation using Standard Citation Forms

E. ____ Genre field 655

F. ____ Place of publication 752

G. ____ 755 with thesarus term
Binding (rbbin) Paper (rbpap)
Type (rbtyp) Provenance (rbprov)
Printing & Publishing (rbpri)

H. ____ 700 or 710 field with $4 relator term HH. _____ $e

I. ____ RECORD USES STANDARDS (One or more of A-H)

J. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A) only

K. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A) and Gatherings Note (B)

L. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A) and Citation Note (C)

M. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A), Gatherings Note (B) and Citation Note (C)

N. ____ Record uses Access Point(s) (E-H)

O. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A) and Access Point(s) (E-H)

P. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription (A), Access Point(s) (E-H), and Gatherings Note (B)

Q. ____ Record uses DCRB Transcription, Access Point(s) (E-H), and Citation Note (C)

R. ____ Record uses DCRB transcription (A), access point(s) (E-H), gatherings note (B), and citation note (C)

S. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Gatherings Note (B)

T. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Citation Note (C)

U. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Gatherings note (B), and Citation Note (C)

V. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Access Point(s) (E-H)

W. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Gatherings note (B), and Access Point(s) (E-H)

X. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Citation note (C), and Access Point(s) (E-H)

Y. ____ Record DOES NOT USE DCRB transcription (A) and uses Gatherings note (B), Citation note (C), and Access Point(s) (E-H)

APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF DCRB TRANSCRIPTION RULES EXCERPTED FROM EXAMPLES TO ACCOMPANY THE DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING OF RARE BOOKS AND CONSTRUCTION OF SPECIAL ACCESS FIELDS

A. Transcription of 245, 250 and 260

1. Double Punctuation (0E, par 5)

245 10 Tyrannick love; or, The royal martyr. : $b A tragedy. : As it is acted by His Majesty's servants at the Theatre Royal. / $c By John Dryden ... [From Example 26B]

2. Inseparably Linked Elements: Statement of responsibility inseparably linked to title elements (1B1)

245 10 Renati Des Cartes Geometria : $b unà cum notis Florimondi de Beaune, in curia Blesensi consiliarii regii ... [From Example 25]

3. Edition Statement Fully Transcribed

250 Editio renovata, & terti^a parte auctior. [From Example 21]

4. $a Word or phrase before name of principal place of publication (4B2), $b fully transcribed with publisher statements in more than one source and words or phrases preceding publisher statements transcribed; addresses omitted (4C6, par. 2), $c phrase in date transcribed (4D1):

260 Tot Middelburgh : $b By Zacharias Roman ... : $b Gedruckt by Hans vander Hellen ..., $c anno 1636. [From Example 20]

5. Multiple publisher statements; first statement plus [and x others] (4C6, par. 1)

260 London : $b Printed for J. Round ... [and 11 others], $c 1740. [From Example 35]

B. Gatherings Note

500 Signatures: A-Y^{12} [From Example 20]

C. Citation Note

510 4 Baudrier, H.L. Bib. lyonnaise, $c VIII, p. 302 [From Example 12]

D. Genre Field:

655 _7 Travel literature. $2 rbgenr [From Example 34]

E. Place of Publication:

752 United States $b Ohio $d Cleveland [Bibliographic Formats and Standards, 7:18-19]

F. Thesaurus Term 755

755 Fictitious imprints (Publishing) $z France $y 18th century. $2 rbpub

755 Printing in multiple colors (Printing) $z France $y 18th century. $2 rbpri [From Example 39]

G. 700 field with relator term:

700 1 Newbery, John, $d 1713-1767. $4 bsl

700 1 Newbery, John, $d 1713-1767. $e bookseller

ENDNOTES

1. Paul S. Dunkin, How to Catalog a Rare Book, 2d ed., rev. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), 1.
2. Ibid., 4.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 102.
5. Laura Stalker and Jackie M. Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging and Rare Books," Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship 7, no. 1 (1992): 9.
6. Melissa C. Flannery, "A Review of Recent Developments in Rare Books Cataloging," Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 7, no. 1 (Fall 1986): 56.
7. Bobs M. Tusa, "An Overview of Applications of Automation to Special Collections: Rare Books and Art Collections," Information Technology and Libraries 12, no. 3 (1993): 345.
8. Susan A. Adkins, "Automated Cataloging of Rare Books: A Time for Implementation," Collection Management 16, no. 1 (1992): 98.
9. Ibid., 90, 93.
10. Suzy Taraba, "Administering the Cataloging of Special Collections Materials," Rare Books & Manscripts Librarianship 7, no. 2 (1991): 87; Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 7; Jackie M. Dooley, "Conundrums for Rare Book Catalogers," Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship 7, no. 2 (1992): 79
11. Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 13.
12. Flannery, 58.
13. Stephen Paul Davis, "Bibliographic Control of Special Collections: Issues and Trends," Library Trends 36 (Summer 1987): 124.
14. Ibid., 121.
15. Flannery, 55.
16. Ibid., 57.
17. John B. Thomas, III, "The Necessity of Standards in an Automated Environment," Library Trends 36 (Summer 1987): 126.
18. Ibid., 126-127.
19. Davis, 119.
20. Ibid., 116.
21. Ibid., 117.
22. Ibid., 117-118
23. Ibid., 124.
24. Tusa, 344.

25. Adkins, 91-92.
26. Flannery, 56.
27. Tusa, 345.
28. Thomas, 130.
29. Ibid., 131.
30. Ibid., 132.
31. Flannery, 57.
32. Thomas, 132.
33. Ibid.
34. Flannery, 57.
35. Adkins, 101.
36. Ibid., 92.
37. Flannery, 58.
38. Ibid., 62-63.
39. Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 8.
40. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books, 2nd ed., (Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1991), v.
41. Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 14.
42. Dooley, "Conundrums," 80.
43. Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Bibliographic Standards Committee. Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books, (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1993), iii.
44. Taraba, 87.
45. Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 7.
46. Dooley, "Conundrums," 79.
47. Stalker and Dooley, "Descriptive Cataloging," 13.
48. Davis, 124.
49. Taraba, 87.
50. Jackie M. Dooley, "Conundrums," 83.
51. Adkins, 93.
52. As of July 1, 1991 there were 430,000 records for books produced between 1450 and 1800 in the OCLC database. As of July 1, 1996 there were 775,000. Between July 1, 1991 and July 1, 1996, 345,000 records for books produced between 1450 and 1800 were added to the OCLC database.
53. Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. "Relator Terms for Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Cataloging," 2d ed. College & Research Libraries News 42 (October 1981): 322-25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, Susan A. "Automated Cataloging of Rare Books: A Time for Implementation." Collection Management 16, no. 1 (1992): 89-102.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Bibliographic Standards Committee. Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1993.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Bibliographic Standards Committee. Type Evidence: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Bibliographic Standards Committee. Paper Terms: a Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. Binding Terms, a Thesaurus for Use inRare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1987.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. Genre Terms: a Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1983.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. Printing & Publishing Evidence: a Thesauri for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1986.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. Provenance Evidence: Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1988.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. Standards Committee. "Relator Terms for Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Cataloging." 2nd ed. College & Research Libraries News 42 (October 1981): 322-25.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards. OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 1993.

Davis, Stephen Paul. "Bibliographic Control of Special Collections: Issues and Trends." Library Trends 36 (Summer 1987): 109-24.

Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1991.

Dooley, Jackie M. "Conundrums for Rare Book Catalogers." Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship 7, no. 2 (1992): 79-84.

Dunkin, Paul S. How to Catalog a Rare Book. 2d ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Flannery, Melissa C. "A Review of Recent Developments in Rare Books Cataloging." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 7, no. 1 (Fall 1986): 55-62.

National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints. London: Mansell, 1968.

Powell, Ronald R. Basic Research Methods for Librarians. 2d ed. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1994.

Stalker, Laura. "Descriptive Cataloging and Rare Books." Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship 7, no. 1 (1992): 7-23.

Taraba, Suzy. "Administering the Cataloging of Special Collections Materials." Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship 7, no. 2 (1992): 87-90.

Thomas, John B., III. "The Necessity of Standards in an Automated Environment." Library Trends 36 (Summer 1987): 125-139.

Tusa, Bobs M. "An Overview of Applications of Automation to Special Collections: Rare Books and Art Collections." Information Technology and Libraries 12, no. 3 (September 1993): 344-52.

Van Wingen, Peter and Stephen Davis. Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies and Catalogs Used in Rare Book Cataloging. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1982.